

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life

VOL. I

The Principia

PROSPECTUS.

THE AMERICAN OLIGARCHY—WHICH IS LIES ITS STRENGTH?

NUMBER NINE.

CASTE IN AMERICA. FURTHER PARAPLULRS.

It is time to look more directly at the several distinct American castes, as already established. Primarily, there appeared to be but two—the slaveholders and the slaves. Almost instantly, however, there was seen to be an intermediate caste, the non-slaveholders who were not slaves. These may have supposed themselves on an equality with the slaveholders. But their subordinate station soon became apparent, the distance between them has been widening over since, and must continue to widen, till slaveholding is done away. Every year, the Chitteree caste takes a still higher position, and the *Bico*, or *Vaisya* a still lower one. Our national politics clearly indicate this.

A fourth caste in America, as before noticed, is found in the so-called free people of color, who are composed of emancipated slaves, fugitives from slavery, or the descendants of such, and thus connected with the slaves.

A fifth caste is seen in the non-slaveholding whites of the slave States, including the "old masters," as now distinguished from the non-slaveholding whites of the non-slaveholding States.

case, like most off-shore hydrogeologists, I'm on their payroll at some vital points, as long as it's off-shore.

A slight variation of this has sprung from the two, usually profitless, efforts of elsewhere heretofore, and like the others that have been mentioned, is the legitimate offspring of the same original pair. We add to the *atmosphere* of color and light a distinction rendering both into two other cases, and in a manner, reducing them all into two.

As the African race of stable hue were probably, and have been generally, the slaves, a corresponding degradation attaches to that race and hue. And as the slaveholders have generally been white, a corresponding dignity, in the comparison, attaches to that race and color, insomuch, that in process of time, the contrast has become so marked, that the Supreme Court of the nation, has ventured to declare that the black man "has no rights which a white man is bound to respect." The wide-spread astonishment at this declaration, attests that the complete establishment of this caste, has been but just now effected, being of later maturity than the preceding ones, and of the same parentage—that, in other words, the caste of color and race, originated in slavery; and consequently that slavery did not, as some suppose, arise from the previously existing caste of race and color.

Had it so happened that in America, as in some countries, the slaves and slaveholders had been of the same race and color; or if the blacks had been the slaveholders and the whites the slaves, there would have been no degradation attached to the African lineage or complexion—as there is not, in Russia, where both the nobles and the serfs are white, and of the same race, or general division of the same human family.

In Macon, Georgia, during the last century, a colored man was a member of the colored or "Sons of Justice," representing a company of mostly white individuals, and another colored man, Rev. Isomay Haynes, was the much beloved and respected pastor of a church and congregation of whites, and in high esteem among his clerical brethren.

Colored children, too, in New England and in the State of New York, within the memory of the writer, attended the common schools, on terms of perfect equality and companionship with the children of the most respectable white citizens, nor was any objection made to it, until some time after the existence of the American Colonization Society, which was organized in 1816, a project planned by slaveholders, for the removal of a caste deemed dangerous to the stability of their supremacy. And when, in 1833, a persecution was commenced in Connecticut, New Hampshire, and other States, against teachers of colored schools, the movement was made by friends of the Colonization Society, and much to the astonishment of a large portion of the people of the non-slaveholding States.

Acts of Legislation against them in several of the free states, and the custom of excluding them from vehicles of public conveyance, are also of comparatively modern origin, and have marked with precision, the several successive stages of the increasing control of the slaveholding oligarchy over the nation at large, and over all the slaves, by their acts, while no control of which was explicit.

white slaves, of slaves of the mixed race—of slaves irrespective of lineage, race, or color.

BRUNSWICK CORP. 4 HOLLOWAY

the grand question after all, is what sort of a Bible he believes in? What does he see by its light? What is it revealed to him? For one, I must interpret the Bible best I may, by the aid of the "Light which is within me," about which it is worth no more to me than to a horse. (2) Canon Blomius blindly accepts the guidance of the modern Catholic Church, which, while it gives me the Bible, insists that I shall take with it his interpretation of it, but keeps the Bible herself, the both of which shake bolts of damnation over us if we do not accept his interpretation.

Yours respectfully,

L. C. Houghy

... 000 000 000.

NOTES BY THE EDITOR.

(1) The various phases of Orthodoxy enumerated by L. C. H. present essentially the same system of religious ideas, though incidental and not vital variations—*they do*. If the former, then those variations argue nothing against the truth and importance of the general system, only that the different views of scientific men on the sciences to which they have directed their attention, militate against the general truth, importance and utility of those sciences. Theology is itself a science, the most comprehensive, profound, and important of all the sciences. And it is no mere strange fact that agreement is not yet reached on theological questions, when it is not in the physical sciences. But if the other supposition is true: if those theological schools be essentially diverse and hostile, there would be either heresy or "intolerance" in regarding them. And the same may be said of the "Orthodox" and the "Lax" theologies, as described, if they are indeed opposites. Nor is the importance of inquiry and instruction disengaged. There is a broad distinction and an irreconcilable antagonism between truth and error, which can be asserted, and pointed out; and there is neither greater nor intolerance in the fact or the profession of having, in some good measure, discovered them. There would little use in the theological investigation, or encouragement, if it scientific certainty in religion and morals be not attainable and useful.

(1) It is a cheap way of occupying a religious creed or advocate, to say that the professed believers of the creed are not sincere. There are undoubtedly numerous professing *H* creeds. But their insincerity does not disprove the creed. It is indeed a humiliating fact that even true believers in religious truths are not as earnest in the belief of them as they should be. The reproof of *L* should do them good. It seems probable that, in a world abounding in insincerity, the purest and best creeds will be most likely to be professed by hypocritical and designing men; and that, while good men are but imperfectly wise and good, their measure of faith will be likely to fall further below a strictly true and pure creed than below a less pure and untruthful one. The higher the requirements of the creed, the more difficult will it be to live up to it, and honor it, in practice. The purer the creed, the greater the temptation to the hypocritical profession of it, by impure men. No impure man would expect to gain a reputation for purity by professing an impure creed.

It is easy in a world of compromising and self-indulgence, to excite odium against an inflexible, uncompromising, and to represent it as being cruelly and unreasonably severe. But truth and nature will not change for the accommodation of complainers, nor can they be assuaged by ministrations. The laws of gravitation will not be relaxed, because men think it cruel to be crushed by violations of

(5.) "This age and country" are characterized by almost unprecedented corruption, apostacy, and wickedness, as L. is well aware. Can he congratulate himself that in such age and country, the theology he dislikes (but which in purer and better age was generally and earnestly believed) is coming to be held with insincerity or repudiated altogether?

16. If there is to be a theology between these "extremes" either the one thing nor the other, and yet a theology - a purity and power able to turn back, where earnest ye tested a tide of prevailing corruption and iniquity, it is high time that the believers in it, gave it an intelligent expression and a tangible shape.

(7.) If there be a theology, besides orthodoxy, not tinged with gradualism, let it come upon the stage, and directly show itself. The question is *not*, whether the law rectitude is not binding on men not totally depraved, but we presented it, in our "Theologies and Reforms" | whether men not radically wrong can properly be called upon to keep a medical charge? | but, *whether* whether

those who radically wrong may get along without a radical regeneration, but what others who teach that such radical regeneration is needed, can hardly advocate radical reforms? Whether, if a gradual development of human society, by itself, a gradual development of human society, without radical reforms, be not sufficient, I leave to others. Who will think the sins of men and of communities legitimate in their ignorance of what will be done? America has well as her cruel, bitter, profane, and reproachful officials and communities for their sin and guilt? Whether, a consistent with their credo, they will not rather add to the sins of men, by their self-righteous ratiocinations, and by their uncharitable and unmerciful pronouncements, errors of course prove? There is a wide difference between exhorting men to repeat their sins, of which they are guilty, and trying to dispel their ignorance, for which they are not held to be guilty. That many who hold the "law" view, as we call it, have preached inconsistently with it, we distinctly admitted, in our articles. And we raised the question of their self-consistency, and consequently of their probable stability, in urging exhortations at variance with their creeds. An orthodox education, and a moral atmosphere created by a rigorous, almost necessitates orthodoxy in creeds and exhortations, for a time. But when the foundation is removed, all streams fail.

[8] Our predictions, founded on history, observation, and the nature of moral causes and effects, were two-fold. First, that the professors of a radically "orthodox" theology who persisted in refusing to become Radical reformers would ultimately modify the hypocrisy of their complex professions, or else abandon such profanity altogether. Second, that those holding the "Lat. Theology" *et cetera*, taking to advocate Radical Reforms, w'd old be likely to dis-cover in time the incongruity of their position, and bring themselves to a P-consistency by relinquishing either one or the other, or at least, lessing, though incompletely, their hold of them.

Of the *first* of these preliminaries, I, C. very truly says that "slaves already fulfilled in the case of the cotton-commodity of 1827 and 1855," who *wish* to stand all alone from radical reformers. They belong to his category of *insincere* hypocritical professors of orthodoxy "in this age of the world and in this country" in whose advent he strangely seems as a *theologian*, to "rejoice." They belong, as he so truly represents, to the same "class with the pro-slavery slaveholders of the South, and having the same religion, they *cannot* be expected to break fell, wading with them. If, to their professions of the ethical religion they have ever added profession of being reformers, anti-slavery men, abolitionists, those professions are, of course, found to be equally hollow. Their religion, as L. C. describes it, has been only of the idle class and of the *specious* sort of the *hypocrite*, the wife resulting in "orthodox" *abortion*. We trust our friend L. C. does not suppose or intend to influence, that the *so-called* *hypocritical* professed body of the pro-slavery men of the North and of the South, is at all responsible for the characters of those who "lead it in un-

right in the lawlessness and hypocrisy.) A year ago we predicted, we see in parentheses its fulfillment, almost daily. As for example, "The Dr. Parker," who is alluded to in our article, a representative man, a "Liberator," begin, heraldized as a radical reformer and abolitionist, yet holding that the first abolition of slavery was a "backward step in human progress," of its organization of labor, "the Dr. Parker" now comes out with a recommendation of wine drinking as a substitute for total abstinence, and "a license law in preference to prohibition." Thus "The Liberator," likewise, who had been lauded as a radical reformer of "this age"—and was thus recognized, even by a "conservative" in this country—turns up an enormous beer-breakfast and an earnest advocate, while we say a brief word of the treatment of the slaves, of the bound slaves

of the British West Indies.'

Much has been said of the tendency of our modern reformers to embrace and propagate these creeds. The hypocrisy of professing such a religion is partly responsible for it. But there is another cause.

In these ranks at least, there are, if I am not mistaken, many persons who, with all knowledge have renounced the old way of thinking, they have first withdrawn themselves from radicalism, consented to compromise, and then espoused the views of the 'Left'.

... scores of such in all parts of the country, with whom we have either met or corresponded.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY

Policemen insist the slavery must not be interfered with, unless it exists under the shield of state sovereignty. Can they offer a sensible reason why it must not be interfered with? Men of the "so-called race," who believed unswervingly in carrying on the government, should understand what our government is not. They should be able to define State sovereignty, and explain its powers and limitations. If they believe governors have authority to shield slaves, they should show from what source the authority derived, and for what purpose it is conferred.

Others, who do not consider themselves slaveholders,

If they assume the general obligation of government to *protect*, *reform*, and *abolish* rights, they should offer no mitigating reasons, if any exist, why its prostitution to the *subjugation* of slaves should, in any case, be tolerated. The common notion of State sovereignty has no better support than the thoughtlessness which results from indifference to the difference of humanity. It is a vague idea of State authority, unconnected with the idea of obligation, at least, the obligation of right. It ignores the distinction between State rights and State *gratuity*. It does not necessarily include the idea of protection, of redressing the wronged, and of defending the feeble. In short, it is a *superstition* that guards the entrance of all roads to the crushed vices of State despotism.

The following definition of State sovereignty, if accepted would counteract its mischiefs: *State sovereignty is the authority of the people of a State to do, through their State organization, whatever is necessary for their own welfare, and cannot be interfered with by others, nor with the general rights of property.*

We might have said *State sovereignty* is the authority of the people of a *State*, to secure their own welfare, by the administration of justice, but we have no space.

Our definition has three qualities to commend it to favor. The first is, that it gives to a *State*, the fullest possible privilege of sovereignty, the privilege of doing all that is necessary for its welfare. The restraint of justice is so far from being a restriction of the privilege, that it is ~~essential~~ to it.

As a *second* quality, the definition assumes that State sovereignty belongs to the whole people and not to a person or those who manage to get the State organization under

Thirdly, the defendant is of the opinion that it is right, without as well as within the State, that the rights and the rests of State cannot be disregarded by the growth and interests of the State in its government. You cannot imagine a State without being composed of people having no claims. A state government, and especially a government of a large state, must be subject to a number of the wants of a large population, and the wants of the whole state. When I was writing my "State of the Union," I said, "These demands are not to be denied, because they are very real." These rights demand to be legible. These states shall be in harmony with each other, and favor the reciprocal duties

me and my children? I have property and the
right to give it away as I see fit. The law of the
State of New York does not interfere with me in
this. If I want to give my property to my son, I can do so.
The Supreme Court, quoting from the New York State
constitution, says that no man may be molested with
respect to his property, and the New York State is bound
to respect the property rights of its citizens. And surely if I
have a right to give away all the property I own,
my wife and my children have a right to inherit it.
The law of the State of New York does not interfere
with me in this. I have the right to do what I please.
My property passes by the laws of the State which
I inhabit, and I have the right to do what I please. The
people of the State of New York will not interfere with
me in this. My wife and my children have a right to
inherit my property. The law of the State of New
York does not interfere with me in this. I have the
right to do what I please.

Friends, I know a right to make human creatures, and
all earthly substances, with common consent, subservient
to all parts of my happiness. A sound understanding tells me even
that I may read this right in as simple a title as "a man's
right to his life, and liberty, and property." But, notwithstanding
the clearness of this title, it is not to be denied that it is not
entirely clear. I will show the State of Massachusetts
what it means in practice. I mean also to pay a visit
to the State of New York, to see what it means there.
I am not particularly anxious, or whatever it may be, that all
these acts shall be, by right of a general judgment, a violation
of personal and corporal labor against the right of dominion
privately.

To us a familiar metaphor, society is a body, it was said, and man and woman in our nation, even a member of the family of the realm, is a member of a community. The body of the realm is the nation, and the members of the body are the men and women who compose the rest of the realm. The body with its members is the nation, and the nation is the body of the realm, the Union. The body with its members is the nation, and the nation is the body of the realm. Slavery is a disease which reaches every member of the body. No member can by his or her own power alone, cure the disease. The effort of one man, no matter how illustrious, of all the past, and the States and other portions of her people, peacefully assimilate all the world, does not help the following. You are not able to save the world from the curse of present slavery, and you cannot save the world from the curse of future slavery. Is such a disease an excuse? Is State A right against State B? Is State B right against any other rights? Let me repeat, as I did before, in a co-existence belief. He who, as an author, has written a book, is so far a slave, and it safe against further violations.

If the foregoing view of State sovereignty is correct, the sovereignty is outraged by slavery, does who constitute portion of the people, and, by "territorial usurpation," it is compelled to act, so as to protect its slaves. The Federal Government is bound to protect the slaves, and to put down such an usurpation, and sustain the power, right, and influence of State affairs, are the only advocates of State sovereignty. If the Federal Government is the advocate of State rights as exercised by the white people, it is difficult to see what could our Southern brethren derive from it? As State sovereignty, creates no疆界, no boundaries, makes no laws, and has no power, it is of course, of no avail to us, whether it is or is not, the advocate of foreigners, again the sovereignty of the States. And what is the point that is presented? In a word, it is, that a State has a right, an absolute and unqualified right, to do as it pleases, and to do as it sees fit.

Notes.—V. cannot refrain from remarking, that we are being well think of disowning our country, if we do not say, that the Federal Government at the time of the War, was not the 200,000,000 slaveholders. We know that the Slave owners of 1860, were 1,000,000 less than those in 1850; but still millions of Slave, and nearly six million of free-skinned, the people of the Free State, ought to be taught one of two things, as Mr. Jefferson advised might be done. But two thousand years ago, Mr. Jefferson advised might be done to the slaves, whereas the slaves, and their descendants, will be as bad as they could be made.

There is no such thing as a Slave system. But there is a system of Slaveholding, that they have no name of in South Carolina. The Cotton, the Slave-holders, who are employed, hold them up as an inferior caste, but fit like themselves. The false idea of "Slave system," is only a means by L.S. to furnish us of the best thing in the world, the Slave system. We have been led to consider the Slave system as the greatest sin, and the secret of all evil. The Slave system that perverts a whole class of men, is far from understanding the "Slave system." It never reaches the heart, or the reason of the thing, which really exists.—Editor.

The Principals.

卷之三

News of the Day.

